

REMARKS

Claims 1-53 are now pending in the application. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 50 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 50 and 51 have been amended to recite "home appliances" in place of the objected-to language. The objected-to language of claim 1 has been deleted. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-48, 50 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Blackett et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,944,555).

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackett et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,944,555) in view of Valadarsky et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0111755).

Claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackett et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,944,555) in view of Dage et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,640,890).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In applicant's system the node element itself includes a proxy having a universal format interface that makes available a local control interface of a first local load device available and that allows remote control of the first local load device, through the universal format interface, using a universal format different from a local control protocol of the first load device. Thus applicants' system will support peer-to-peer operation where the self-contained proxy handles the universal formatting requirements.

In contrast, the Blackett et al system is designed to work with a separate proxy server. See Blackett's discussion of the proxy server at col. 23, lines 46-55. Blackett does not teach or suggest inclusion of the proxy within the node element itself. Valadarsky and Dage are similarly silent on this issue.

Accordingly, in order to more fully distinguish applicants' invention in this regard, the independent claim has been amended to recite the applicants' inclusion of a proxy in the node element. It is respectfully submitted that the claim now fully distinguished applicants' invention from the cited references.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 14, 2009_____

By: /Gregory A. Stobbs/_____
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS//PFD/evm

14679204.1